U.S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

№ AU 472	(Rev. 3/86) Order of Detention Pending That								
	UNITED STA	ATES DIST	RICT (COURT					
		District of			Delaware				
	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA								
	V.			_	ION PEND	DING TRIAL			
	Darrin Burns	Case	98-5	78 _M					
	Defendant		-	,	1 11 5 11				
In acc detention	cordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(of the defendant pending trial in this case.			id. I eonciude	inat the follow	ving racts require the			
(1)	The defendant is charged with an offense described in or local offense that would have been a federal offense a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 315 an offense for which the maximum sentence is lift an offense for which a maximum term of imprison	se if a eircumstance g 56(a)(4). fe imprisonment or d)(1) and has b giving rise to fi eath.	ederal jurisdic	of a ☐ fedetion had existed	eral offense state d that is			
	a felony that was committed after the defendant l	had been convicted o	f two or more	prior federal o	offenses describ	ped in 18 U.S.C.			
(3)	§ 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses. (2) The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense. (3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction release of the defendant from imprisonment for the offense described in finding (1). (4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption.								
	• • • •	lternative Findings							
X (1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense X for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in 21 USC § 841 X under 18 U.S.C. § 924(e).								
X□ (2)	The defendant has not rebutted the presumption estab			or combination	on of condition	s will reasonably assure			
	the appearance of the defendant as required and the s								
(1)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will not app	lternative Findings	(B)						
(2)									
									
	Dout II Weitten	Statement of Rea	sons for Do	tontion					
Lfind	that the credible testimony and information submitted				eonvincing evi	dence a prepon-			
derance o which wa known en defendant with sellin Between threatenin controlled	f the evidence: At present, defendant does not oppose is granted. Although defendant has lived most of his limited ployment was in 2006 which ended when he was income it is substance abuse history is limited, according to his ing them (an honest but not stellar recommendation). If 1993 to June 1994, defendant had 9 arrests and criming, offensive touching and VOP. Some of the highlight substance (2001 & 2002 in which defendant was required.	d the government's natife in DE and his father terms of the father, he does not have the criminal history be all convictions which the of his eriminal particle to serve an additional particle to serve and the ser	notion for dete ler is a pastor of state probation ave a problem began at age 15 included thef st as an adult i itional year of	ntion, but rese with who he h n. Defendant with using ille 5 with a juveni t over \$500, re nelude possess probation), m	erves the right tass a close relations as a close relations as a close relation feed on the conviction feed in the conviction of a non-naintaining a version of a version of a version of a conviction of a co	to do so in the future ionship, his last years old. Although rather a problem for assault 2d. property, terroristic arcotic schedule I thicle for controlled			
	s in February 2001 (for which he had 2 VOPs in 2002	**							
	ol for which he was found in VOP in 2003, 2004 and to n of drug paraphernalia in 2006, possession with inten	-							
violated p	robation in June and August 2007. Defendant has had bees. Further several terms of probation have been revoconvictions above do NOT include the numerous of or	d 25 capiases and/or	warrants were	issued for his	failure to appe	ar for numerous court			
			;	MAR 2	5 2008				

	Case 1:08-cr-00056-GMS	Document 7	Filed 03/25/2008	Page 2 of 2			
№ AO 472 (Re	v. 3/86) Order of Detention Pending Trial						
to the extent preasonable op Government, t	dant is committed to the custody of the Attor bracticable, from persons awaiting or servi portunity for private consultation with defende person in charge of the corrections facility that a court proceeding. March 25, 2008	ng sentences or being he ense counsel. On order of	ated representative for eonfine eld in custody pending appeal of a court of the United States lant to the United States marsh	The defendant shall be afforded a sor on request of an attorney for the al for the purpose of an appearance in			
	Date	(Signature of Individual Office Mary Pat Thynge, Magistrate J				
		Name and Title of Judicial Officer					
	ieable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 Vection 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C.		-				